

REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 29, 2000 with claims 1-19. Claims 1, 17 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-17 and 19 remain pending, and claims 1, 17 and 19 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated August 9, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,963,909 to Warren et al. (hereinafter “Warren”).

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Warren, Applicants have amended claims 1, 17 and 19 in an effort to expedite the application through to issuance. Independent claims 1, 17 and 19 have been amended to recite that a subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys are selected for transfer to the receiving client, wherein the subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys comprises fewer cryptographic token keys than the plurality of cryptographic token keys. Further the receiving client is enabled to decrypt a subset of encrypted sequential data blocks that correspond to the subset of cryptographic token keys transferred, wherein the subset of the plurality of encrypted sequential data blocks comprises fewer encrypted sequential data blocks than the plurality of encrypted sequential data blocks, thereby enabling access to only a selected portion of the media file. Support for this amendment can be found on page 4, lines 7-11, page 11, lines 5-10 and page 12, lines 6-11 of the specification.

Warren discloses the reproduction of a full multimedia data signal through the use of multimedia frames and encryption keys. However, Warren fails to disclose the selection of a subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys, which is fewer than the total number of cryptographic token keys, for transfer to the receiving client. Warren also fails to disclose that this subset of cryptographic token keys allows for the decryption of a subset of the sequential data blocks, and the ability to access only a selected portion of the media file by the receiving client, as recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 19 of the present invention.

Dependent claims 2-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, and also contain patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is therefore respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. SOM919990010US1

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-17 and 19 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 9, 2005

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547